UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,941	02/24/2004	Daniel Manhung Wong	50277-2406	3803

42425   7590   08/06/2008
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083

EXAMINER
PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/786,941	WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	MICHAEL PHAM	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 September 2007*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/14-6/30*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

1.   Claims 1-26 are pending.

2.   Claims 1-26 are unamended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 - 2, 7 - 9, 14 - 15, and 19 - 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Yao (US 2004/0254948).

5.   Regarding claims 1 and 14, Yao teaches a machine-implemented method and

machine-readable storage medium for executing a database statement, the method comprising the

steps of: a database server receiving a request to execute a database statement, wherein the

request specifies the database Statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language

(See page 4, paragraph [0046] "The tags, in a preferred embodiment, are made part of comments

in the ETL SQL file 440. Since they are in comments, known mechanisms will ignore the tags

present in the comments such that the known mechanisms may execute and test the ETL SQL

file 440 under a command line environment." Here, the tag and the statement are being received from the command line.)

wherein said tag specifies at least one parameter field and at least one parameter value (See page 4, paragraph [0045] "These tags may contain variables that define parameters for the execution of the enterprise transient system 410." And see age 4, paragraph [0047] showing an example of a tags with their parameter and values i.e. " iwh.test_r " with the parameter being "SourceTable" and value being "iwh.test_r".)

in response to receiving the request, said database server storing the tag [operational data] (See page 3, paragraph [0042] "The ETL system performs extraction, transformation and load processes on the operational data of the server 104 such that the operational data may be stored in a structured form in the storage 106 for later analysis and query." And see page 5, paragraph [0050] "The modified SQL instructions are executed on the operational data of the enterprise transient system 410 via the enterprise system interface 470. The resulting extracted operational data is stored in the data warehouse storage system 430 via the data warehouse interface 480.")

said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values [tag parameters] through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server (See page 4, paragraph [0046] "However, in accordance with the present invention a driver mechanism is provided in the ETL system 420 that parses such 'comments to determine what tags and tag parameters are present in the comments in order to determine how to execute the SQL instructions in the ETL SQL file 440.")

6.   Regarding claims 2 and 15, Yao additionally teaches the database statement is

written in a language in which results desired are specified, but no procedures for obtaining the

results desired are specified. (See page 4, paragraph [0047] example 1 shows the database

statement written in SQL, a declarative language as specified in the instant application's

specification page 2, paragraph [0005].)

7.   Regarding claims 7 and 19, Yao additionally teaches the tag comprises an

indicator of a beginning of the tag, and an indicator of an end of the tag. (See page 4, paragraph

[0047] example 1, showing angle brackets... ; the end of the tag is indicated by a slash '/'.)

8.   Regarding claims 8 and 20, Yao additionally teaches the at least one parameter

value is located between the indicator of the beginning and the indicator of the end of the tag.

(See page 4, paragraph [0047] Example 1, showing the parameter value "true", being located

between the and , which are indicators of the beginning and end of the tag.)

9.   Regarding claims 9 and 21, Yao teaches each of the at least one parameter fields

comprises an indicator of a beginning of the parameter field, followed by the parameter value,

which in turn is followed by an indicator of an end of the parameter field. (See page 4, paragraph

[0047] Example 1, showing the parameter value "true", being located between the and , which

are indicators of the beginning and end of the tag.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 3, 4, 6, 10-12, 16, 18, 22-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Yao as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Lin et al.

(hereinafter Lin, US 2001/0021929).

12.   Regarding claims 3 and 16, Yao discloses a method and medium substantially as

claimed. Yao does not explicitly disclose a priority for executing the database statement is

determined based on the at least one parameter value. However, Lin discloses a priority for

executing the database statement is determined based on the at least one parameter value. (See

page 2, paragraph [0028] "There are various aspects of user management including ....

setting of the user priority, ... setting of the priority of returned query results, etc." and page 3,

paragraph [0033] "Herein the appended parameters include information such as query attributes,

query priorities, and designated receiving devices.") It would have been obvious to one with

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yao and Lin

because both references are related to querying a database and using command tags or control

means for optimizing the process. By including the priority teaching as disclosed in Lin, the

method and medium are more efficient as it is commonly known in the art that priorities are used

for optimization. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to include a priority for executing the database statement is determined based on the at

least one parameter value.

13.   Regarding claims 4 and 26, the combination of Yao and Lin additionally teaches a

security level is associated with the at least one parameter such that whether the database is

entitled to access a component is based on the at least one parameter. (See Lin page 2, paragraph

[0028] "There are various aspects of user management, including authentication of the user

identity, setting of the user priority..." and see Lin page 4, paragraph [0050] "Thereby, the user

identity is authenticated. If the user is legal, the following steps are executed." The identified

user, and specifically their priority, could be considered the security level of the user.)

17. Regarding claims 6 and 18, the combination of Yao and Lin additionally teaches the at least

one parameter is related to user context information (See Lin page 3, paragraph [0028] "There

are various aspects of user management including the authentication of the user identity, setting

of the user priority, setting of the service type, setting of the priority of returned query results

etc." Taken together all of these represent the user context information as referred to in the

application.)

14.   Regarding claims 10, 22, and 23, the combination of Yao and Lin additionally

teaches the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing a session space

associated with a database window, wherein the database statement was issued within the session

window. (See Lin page 2, paragraph [0019] "The users can remove the connection after they

have submitted a database query request. The inventive system can call back the users

automatically and continuously after it has received the query results until the users obtain the query results." The session space was defined in the specification as the memory allocated to database sessions. Here, it is clear the connection to that space is ended by removing the connection, therefore, any accessing of the parameter vale that is done, is necessarily done without accessing the session space. Also, the statement had to have been issued during the session window, because the reference shows the connection being removed after the request was submitted, implying there was previously a connection.)

15.   Regarding claims 11 and 24, the combination of Yao and Lin additionally teaches the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing a session space associated with a database window, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window. (See Lin page 2, paragraph [0019] "The users can remove the connection after they have submitted a database query request. The inventive system can call back the users automatically and continuously after it has received the query results until the users obtain the query results." The session space was defined in the specification as the memory allocated to database sessions. Here, it is clear the connection to that space is ended by removing the connection, therefore, any accessing of the parameter vale that is done, is necessarily done without accessing the session space. Also, the statement had to have been issued during the session window, because the reference shows the connection being removed after the request was submitted, implying there was previously a connection.)

16.   Regarding claim 12, the combination of Yao and Lin additionally teaches the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing a session space associated with a database window, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window. (See Lin page 2, paragraph [0019] "The users can remove the connection after they have submitted a database query request. The inventive system can call back the users automatically and continuously after it has received the query results until the users obtain the query results." The session space was defined in the specification as the memory allocated to database sessions. Here, it is clear the connection to that space is ended by removing the connection, therefore, any accessing of the parameter vale that is done, is necessarily done without accessing the session space. Also, the statement had to have been issued during the session window, because the reference shows the connection being removed after the request was submitted, implying there was previously a connection.)

17.   Regarding claims 13 and 25, the combination of Yao and Lin additionally teaches the at least one parameter value can be accessed after a session window has closed, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window. (See Lin page 2, paragraph [0019] "The users can remove the connection after they have submitted a database query request. The inventive system can call back the users automatically and continuously after it has received the query results until the users obtain the query results." The session window was defined in the specification as the period of time during which a communicative connection exists between the user and the database. Here, it is clear the connection is ended, therefore, any accessing of the parameter vale that is done, is necessarily done after the connection has ended. Also, the

statement had to have been issued during the session window, because the reference shows the

connection being removed after the request was submitted, implying there was previously a

connection.)

18.   Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under.35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yao as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Inohara et al. (hereinafter Inohara, US

6,757,670). Yao teaches a method for executing a database statement substantially as shown.

Yao does not explicitly disclose one parameter is accessible to a system administrator. Inohara,

however, teaches one parameter is accessible to a system administrator. (See column 10, lines

10-14 "The administrator associates the query classification definition with the query operation

direction and stores them in the data processing system..." Here, parameters of the database

statement are the operation direction and classification definition.) It would have been obvious to

one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Yao and Inohara because

they are essentially both methods for query processing and by including the teaching of the

system administrator having access to a parameter of Inohara, there can be more security over

who can actually access the parameter, creating a more secure method of database access. It is

for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include one

parameter is accessible to a system administrator.

Response to Arguments

19.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/24/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Applicant's mainly assert the following with regard to the cited references.

**A.   Yao does not disclose "a database server receiving a request to execute a
database statement, wherein the request specifies the database statement and a tag that
does not conform to a database language." Asserting that Yao's database server does not
receive a request specifying a database statement and tags that do not conform to a
database language. That The tags as described by Yao do conform to a database language.**

In response, the examiner disagrees. In regards to Yao's database server does not receive

a request specifying a database statement and tags that do not conform to a database language.

0044, the ETL system operates between the enterprise transient systemand data warehousing

storage system. 0049, An ETL file is invoked to perform ETL on the operational data. 0045,

The ETL file, in a preferred embodiement, is a SQL file that contains one or more SQL

statements or instructions for accessing and/or manipulating operational data in the enterprise

transient system. Therefore, a database server receives a request specifying a database statement

is disclosed

Regarding applicant's assertions directed towards that the tags do conform to a database

language. The examiner disagrees. 0046, known mechanisms will ignore the tags present in the

comments such that the known mechanisms may execute and test the SQL file under a command

environment. Therefore, the tags do not conform to a database language, otherwise, known

mechanisms would further execute the tags.

      B.   Yao does not disclose "said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server." The reasons given are because Yao does not disclose that any of the databases in the ETL system receives requests specifying a database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language. Further stating that because neither database receives requests and tags, neither database could possibly reference the tags. That even if the database server were to receive tags as specified neither, the tags will be treated as comments by the database server and discarded by the database server.

      In response, the examiner disagrees. The 0049, An ETL file is invoked to perform ETL on the operational data of the enterprise transient system. Therefore, a database receives requests and tags. Secondly, in regards to the tags will be treated as comments by the database server and discarded by the database server, the ETL system does not discard the tags, please see 0046 where it discloses that the ETL system parses such comments to determine what tags and tag parameters are present in the comments in order to determine how to execute the SQL instuctions in the ETL SQL file.

      The claim limitations are still broad enough to be disclosed by Yao, and applicant's arguments are unpersuasive over the cited reference. Accordingly, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

21.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Contact Information

22.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3924.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./   /John R. Cottingham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2167   Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
                                                     2167